



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,058	03/08/2001	Mark Parisi	990165	7197
23696	7590	06/03/2004	EXAMINER	
Qualcomm Incorporated Patents Department 5775 Morehouse Drive San Diego, CA 92121-1714			PHU, SANH D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2682	8

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/803,058

Applicant(s)

PARISI, MARK

Examiner

Sanh D Phu

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4,6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on 5/17/2004.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1,3,5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mc Donald, JR. et al (US 2002/0077750) in view of Jones et al (6,337,972).

Regarding to claim 1, see Fig. 1, 2, 3, section [0028] to [0030], Mc Donald, JR disclose a method for transmitting data from a remote reporting unit via a wireless communication network, wherein the method comprises:

Step for generating a status message “automatic status information”, said status message having a value representing one of multiple alternative conditions detected by a remote unit (6) (see Fig.1 and section [0030]);

Step for applying a predetermined mapping scheme to convert said value into a consolidated output (e.g., “At terminal”, “At job site”, “end pour”)(see section [0045]);

Step for transmitting the consolidated output (see section [0030] and [0045])

Mc Donald, JR does not teach a step for generating feature coding for the consolidated output.

On Jones et al ‘s invention, he teaches generating a feature code comprising a message to be transmitted; and transmitting the feature code to a call processing facility (see col. 2, line 6 to col. 3, line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to implement Mc Donald, JR’s method to have a feature code as taught by Jones et al’s in such a way the consolidated output would be encoded into a feature

code to be transmitted so that Mc Donald's method for delivery information can be able to transmit with higher density and shorter bandwidth.

Regarding to claim 3, see Fig. 1, 2, 3, 4, section [0028] to [[0030], Mc Donald et al disclose that said status message comprises a latitude, a longitude, an event code representing an occurrence of one or more predetermined events, and a state code representing one or more states (see section [0030]).

Regarding to claim 5, see Fig. 3, Mc Donald et al disclose a signal-bearing medium (10) tangibly embodying a program of machine-readable instructions executable by a digital processing apparatus (16) to perform operations for transmitting data from a remote unit via a telephone network, said operations comprising:

a remote reporting unit (16,12) for generating a status message (an automatic status information), said status message having a value representing one of multiple alternative conditions detected by the remote reporting unit and applying a scheme to convert said status message into a consolidated output (see section [0028]–[0030]);

Mc Donald, JR does not teach means for generating feature coding for the consolidated output.

On Jones et al 's invention, he teaches generating a feature code comprising a message to be transmitted; and transmitting the feature code to a call processing facility (see col. 2, line 6 to col. 3, line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to implement Mc Donald, JR's method to have a feature code as taught by Jones et al's in such a way the consolidated output would be encoded into a feature code to be transmitted so that Mc Donald's system for delivery information can be able to transmit with higher density and shorter bandwidth.

Regarding to claim 7, Mc Donald et al disclose a remote reporting unit, comprising:

a first sensor (14) for sensing an first event and generating a first status (see section [0028]–[0031]);

a second sensor (22) for sensing a second event and generating a second status (see section [0028]–[0031]);

a wireless transmitter (12) (see section [0013] and [0030];

data processing circuitry (14, 16, 12) for generating a status message, said status message having a value representing one of multiple alternative conditions detected by the first and second sensors and applying a scheme to convert said status message into a consolidated output (see section [0028]–[0030]);

Mc Donald, JR does not teach means for generating feature coding for the consolidated output.

On Jones et al 's invention, he teaches generating a feature code comprising a message to be transmitted; and transmitting the feature code to a call processing facility (see col. 2, line 6 to col. 3, line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to implement Mc Donald, JR's system to have a feature code as taught by Jones et al's in such a way the consolidated output would be encoded into a feature code to be transmitted so that Mc Donald's method for delivery information can be able to transmit with higher density and shorter bandwidth.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claim 2, 4 and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

Art Unit: 2682

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding to claim 2 and 6, the prior art of record does not teach a method/medium for transmitting data from a remote reporting unit via a wireless communication network where the operation of applying a predetermined mapping scheme comprises:

 multiplying each status message by a different predetermined coefficient to create a corresponding multiplicative product; and

 adding the multiplicative products;

 wherein the coefficients are selected to enable reconstruction of each status message by repeated division of the consolidated output by the coefficients.

Regarding to claim 4, the prior art of record does not teach a method for transmitting data from a remote reporting unit via a wireless communication network, where the operation of applying a predetermined mapping scheme comprises:

 multiplying the latitude status message by a first coefficient;

multiplying the longitude status message by a second coefficient;
multiplying the event code by a third coefficient; and
adding results of the foregoing multiplication operations to the state to
create a corresponding multiplicative product.

Response to the Argument

4. Applicant's argument filed on 5/17/2004 has been considered. However, they are not persuasive.

The applicant mainly argues that McDonald does not disclose the limitation "a predetermined mapping scheme to convert a *value* into a consolidated output" and "There is no description whatsoever of a mapping scheme to convert these alleged *status messages* into a consolidated output".

The examiner respectfully disagrees. See Fig.3, page 3, section [0030], lines 42–45, McDonald discloses that the automatic status information (messages) includes both vehicle location information derived from the signal received by the GPS receiver (14) and vehicle delivery state information derived from the signal received from the vehicle condition sensor (22). McDonald

teaches that the signal sends to central server (30) is the automatic status information that consolidates the data of GPS receiver (14) and sensor (22).

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sanh D Phu whose telephone number is (703) 305-8635. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-16:30.

Art Unit: 2682

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on 703-301-6739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-8635.

Sanh D. Phu
Examiner
Art Unit 2682

SP


VIVIAN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

6/1/04